

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-6193

JEROME JULIUS BROWN, SR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

STATE OF MARYLAND; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE
STATE OF MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 96-6194

JEROME JULIUS BROWN, SR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

THERESA A. NOLAN, Judge; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
THE STATE OF MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 96-6195

JEROME JULIUS BROWN, SR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

JOHN W. HARDWICKE, Chief Administrative Law
Judge,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 96-6196

JEROME JULIUS BROWN, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MARYLAND PAROLE COMMISSION,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 96-6197

JEROME JULIUS BROWN, SR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

JOHN W. HARDWICKE; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE
STATE OF MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Benson E. Legg, District Judge. (CA-95-2459-L, CA-95-2407-L, CA-95-2408-L, CA-95-3348-L, CA-93-3649-L, CA-95-1844-L)

Submitted: June 20, 1996

Decided: July 1, 1996

Before HALL, WILKINS, and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jerome Julius Brown, Sr., Appellant Pro Se. John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Maureen Mullen Dove, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant noted these appeals outside the thirty-day appeal period established by Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1), failed to obtain extensions of the appeal periods within the additional thirty-day period provided by Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5), and is not entitled to relief under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). The time periods established by Fed. R. App. P. 4 are "mandatory and jurisdictional." Browder v. Director, Dep't of Corrections, 434 U.S. 257, 264 (1978) (quoting United States v. Robinson, 361 U.S. 220, 229 (1960)). The district court entered its orders on November 19, 1993, January 25, 1995, July 28, 1995, September 5, 1995, and September 6, 1995; Appellant's notices of appeal were filed on January 19, 1996. Appellant's failure to note a timely appeal or obtain an extension of the appeal period deprives this court of jurisdiction to consider this case. We therefore deny certificates of appealability in Nos. 96-6193, 96-6194, 96-6195, and 96-6197, and dismiss all five appeals. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED